The
COMMONWEAL

VOLUME XLII *July* 20, 1945 NUMBER 14

THE WEEK 323
CRUCIAL DAYS FOR BRAZIL *Afranio Coutinho* 326
I DON'T WANT TO GO BACK *Ina Sugihara* 330
COMMUNICATIONS 332
THE SCREEN *Philip T. Hartung* 334
TOO MANY LOAVES, TOO MANY MOUTHS *James Rorty* 335
MORE BOOKS OF THE WEEK 337
They Seek a City—The American Revolution and Its Influence on World Civilization—The Rebirth of Liberal Education—The Asian Legacy and American Life—My Brother Americans—The House in Clewe Street—Family Tree—Big Democracy

THE COMMONWEAL *is indexed in the Reader's Guide, Catholic Periodical Index and Catholic Bookman.*

Published weekly and copyrighted 1945 in the U.S.A., by THE COMMONWEAL Publishing Co., Inc., 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. AShland 4-9685. Entered as second class matter February 9, 1934 at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. U.S. $5 a year. Canada and Foreign $6. Single copies 10c.

Editors: EDWARD SKILLIN, JR.
PHILIP BURNHAM (*now on duty with the armed forces*)

HARRY LORIN BINSSE, *Managing Editor;* MICHAEL WILLIAMS, *Special Editor;* C. G. PAULDING, *Literary Editor;* JOHN C. CORT, *Associate Editor;* JOHN BRUBAKER, *Advertising Manager*

What Was Done at San Francisco

IN OUR issue of April 6, 1945, as well as in other issues for April and May, we stated a number of points on which we believed the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were grievously deficient, and we strongly urged that the San Francisco Conference give attention esepecially to these matters. Now that the final draft of the proposed Charter of the United Nations has been published, we feel that it is only fair to describe how the changes in this instrument correspond to the changes we ourselves had urged, and to appraise briefly what we think was accomplished at San Francisco.

(1) We objected very strongly to the membership formula of the Proposals, which read: "Membership of the organization should be open to all peace-loving states." The new formula is better, although it retains the objectionably indefinite phrase, *peace-loving*. Article 3 of the Charter provides that the original members of the United Nations shall be those which participated in the San Francisco Conference, or else had previously signed the United Nations Declaration, and who sign the present Charter and ratify it. Article 4 reads:

> 1. Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization are able and willing to carry out these obligations.
>
> 2. The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Here, we believe, a definite gain has been achieved.

(2) In the Proposals no reference whatever was made to the status of mandated and colonial territories. In the Charter, this matter is dealt with at some length in Chapters XI and XII. These chapters relate to what is now called the "International Trusteeship System." In general the United Nations recognize an excellent set of principles as properly governing those countries responsible "for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government." But the implementation of these principles is vague, except as it relates to "such territories as may be placed" under the International Trusteeship System "by subsequent individual agreements." We are left wondering precisely what is intended for the older colonies of the great European powers. We suspect that to them apply only the principles stated in Chapter XI. These principles, as we have said, are admirable, but their being put into effect seems to depend entirely on the good will of the colonial powers.

(3) We objected to the application of the two-thirds rule to "important decisions of the General Assembly." The rule still stands and we still object.

(4) The proposals declared that "all members of the Organization should obligate themselves to accept the decisions of the Security Council." Article 25 of the Charter still requires this, but nations which are not represented on the Council are given a certain degree of protection in Articles 31, 32 and 44. Here is a slight improvement.

(5) The aspect of the Proposals to which we have most strongly objected is the machinery for amendment. This machinery has been somewhat expanded in the Charter. It is now additionally provided that "a General Conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council . . ." It is further provided that alterations of the present Charter recommended by a two-third vote of such a Conference will go into effect when ratified by two-thirds of the Members of the United Nations, including *all* the permanent members of the Security Council. Finally, "if such a conference has not been held before the tenth annual session of the General Assembly following the coming into force of the present Charter, the proposal to call such a con-

THE LIBRARY
ST. CHARLES SEMINARY
CARTHAGENA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held if so decided by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council." Here, again, is an improvement, but the machinery for ratifying amendments remains cumbersome and leaves a final veto power in the hands of any *one* of the Big Five.

(6) Big Five control of the Military Staff Committee remains absolute.

(7) Our suggestion that some sort of Bill of Rights be included in the Charter, especially with relation to freedom of communications, has been met by several pious passages. We are glad at least to see these ideas incorporated in the Charter, particularly as they are expressed in Articles 55 and 62, but again no real implementation is provided.

The San Francisco Charter covers more ground with more words and states more sound principles than were to be found in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. But the improvement in the former over the latter is largely verbal. Everything still depends upon the integrity and good will of the nations involved, and with the continuance of absolutely sovereign nation states, this integrity and this good will are weak foundations on which to build. We favor the ratification of the Charter. We are deeply aware of how much hard work went into formulating it. But let no one think that we have here an automatic machinery to rid the world of war. Only continued hard work, particularly as applied to the besetting problem of nationalism, can eventually yield us what the whole world's heart desires.

Attack from the Left

WE HAVE become quite inured to attacks from all sorts of quarters—particularly from the extreme Right and Left. In recent months the more strongly nationalist Polish press has on occasion spoken its mind concerning our policy with regard to Russia; amusingly enough, the communist Polish press has been equally dissatisfied with THE COMMONWEAL. And the *Daily Worker* has amused itself of late with caustic dissections of matter we have published. By and large such criticism we have almost viewed as a compliment, since it cancels itself out, and tends to indicate that our policy steers a middle course—which is precisely what we have intended. But a few days ago Moscow's *Pravda* coupled us with the *Catholic World* as being an irresponsible advocate of war with Russia. To this accusation we felt it necessary to issue a denial, since here there is not the slightest element of truth. The following brief statement was therefore given to the press on July 9:

"*Pravda's* observer can never have read THE COMMONWEAL. For the past three and a half years we have consistently urged the need of doing everything possible to cement Russian-American cooperation and we have attacked all elements in this country irresponsibly pushing us toward a break with Russia. We have been so consistent in this policy that many have accused us of being blindly pro-Russian. It is inexcusable for a newspaper of *Pravda's* importance to make the accusation it has made in the case of an American Catholic paper which has leaned over backward to avoid doing what *Pravda* accuses us of having done. The only possible justification for such an attack would rest on an occasional letter of protest against our own editorial policy published in our letters-to-the-editors column. Anyone who reads THE COMMONWEAL will realize that *Pravda's* assertion either is based on complete ignorance or is a deliberate falsehood."

For the sake of the record let us here briefly restate what has constantly been our Russian policy. We make no apology for that peculiar brand of doctrine and politics labeled communism. As anyone who has ever dealt with it knows, it is unscrupulous and systematically justifies the means by the ends. We are likewise dubious of the foreign policy of the Russian State, as distinguished from the general policy of world communism. We believe moreover that the latter has become largely subservient to the former. We believe that Russian foreign policy is potentially a great danger to the world. But we equally believe that this policy is not made of cast iron—let alone of granite—and that history has shown it to be most pliable and flexible. We believe that therefore a proper degree of wisdom, firmness and patience on our part can lead to a Russian foreign policy which in no way would threaten the peace of the world, and we believe that to the wisdom, firmness and patience which we have constantly urged there must be added strict justice and honesty and much sincere understanding on our side. Finally we believe that war between ourselves or between any combination of nations and the USSR would be a most terrible tragedy which it is the greatest duty of statesmanship today to avoid.

"The End Is Where We Start From"

—T. S. Eliot.

THE war in Europe threw a light on Europe so that the ruins stood out sharply with one wall in the sunlight and one wall in the shadow; the advancing troops measured Europe and each

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one of us here crossed the desert from Cairo to Tunis, retreated to Stalingrad, returned from Stalingrad; we were in England in the London nights, on the beaches of France, and then all through France and into Germany. There was nothing confused about Europe because American, British and Russian soldiers conducted us through Europe. Wherever they went those who opposed them were our enemies, who helped them our friends. There was an immense simplicity about everything. The countries we were liberating belonged to us, were ours, we held them in our affection.

So long as the war in Europe lasted it was that way and everything was simple about America also. The problems in America were held in suspense. At least that is what we thought; because nothing stays still, nothing is held in suspense. There was the American landscape, the cities, the colored desert, the rivers, the mountains; there were the men in Gary making the steel, the men in Detroit making the tanks, the planes, the men in Los Angeles making the planes and in all the shipyards, in all the factories everywhere, the men making all that was needed for the war. The men taking care of the cattle and those in the slaughterhouse, and then those in the fields all across the country growing the food. Corn fields, wheat fields, the orange groves, the orchards, the potato plants. The railroad men, the truck drivers, the government employees. The men engaged at their business all over the country. And then the mean leaving the country, the soldiers. It was all very simple: there were the men working here and the men fighting in Europe. No matter what anybody said it all came down to that. Everybody in America was thinking about the war in Europe and every day there were the maps in the papers so that Europe became better known every day and after a time there was better news every day from Europe until the war was won.

Then Europe became strange to us again, became foreign to us again. Europe which we had held here in our minds (in trust) has been reclaimed by the minds of Europeans. The people of Holland, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, France, captive and silent had been speaking directly to us in a language we could understand because we lent them our words, our indignation, our sympathy. Now they speak French or Flemish or Danish or Norwegian or Dutch. Perhaps they are speaking still to us; they seem to be speaking intensely among each other; in any case we would need a dictionary.

It is not in the least a return to isolationism; it is that we are reentering the normal condition of life in which one man finds it so difficult to speak to another man, to understand another man or himself.

Jean Laloy of the French Delegation to the United Nations Conference stood on top of the Empire State Building in New York.

"That is the Statue of Liberty," I said.

"Yes, I know about that," he said.

"Brooklyn's over there," I said.

"What's Brooklyn?" Laloy said.

"Brooklyn's enormous, and then it's Long Island and then if you come back to the mainland it's New England and Harvard and Mount Monadnock, because the glaciers came there, and Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, but if you go up that river to the left it will be Albany and the Dutch, the great Hudson River houses, Roosevelt's grave; it will be the Erie Canal and the Irish who built it and the railroads with the companies calling for more and more Irish immigrants so that there would be too many of them for the jobs and they could pay them too little; it will be Lake Champlain and the naval battle, and then the Great Lakes, and then Duluth, and then the plains and the mountains until you reach the Pacific. But if you just cross the river and the Jersey meadows it will be Philadelphia with Mr. Barnes's art collection and the Liberty Bell, the Swedes in Wilmington, then it will be the Beale Street Blues in Memphis, Vicksburg that was a battle, Arkansas (pronounced Arkansaw) and Texas, Texas, and then Spanish names in New Mexico and all the names everywhere in America meaning so much to Americans because of memories connected with every one of them, but it is impossible for you to understand what they mean unless you stay here on top of the Empire State Building and you can't do that because you have to return to France to work with your compatriots to rebuild your country."

"Is America built?" Laloy said.

"Nothing is ever built," I said, "it is always a matter of building and rebuilding. When there is a war you think that winning the war means that everything is settled or when you lose a war you think that everything is settled. But nothing is ever settled. Nothing stands still long enough to be settled. If you want to know what will happen now to America you will have to come back here to see us at work; if I want to know what will happen in Europe I shall have to go to Europe to watch you at work. The war which seemed to tell us what was happening is ended.

Now there are foreign languages, silence.

"I am sorry," I said, "excuse me," I said, "I talk too damn much."

C. G. PAULDING.

Mr. Paulding has decided herewith to terminate this series of commentaries which have appeared with some regularity since 1941 *and his writing will in future appear on other pages of* THE COMMONWEAL.—THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Crucial Days for Brazil

The paradoxes of Brazilian politics

Afranio Coutinho

THE AMERICAN newspaper press has unfortunately presented to citizens of the United States an altogether distorted view of the present political situation in South America's largest and most populous country. Readers of *Time* or *Newsweek* or the *Inter-American* have been given a clearer picture, but a fragmentary one. Since Brazil is at present definitely in a state of political crisis, and since what happens in this great and naturally wealthy country is bound in the long run to affect the United States itself, I shall attempt to give a general picture of the present situation and of the principal personalities involved.

When the United States entered the war after Pearl Harbor, Brazil immediately assumed great importance from a strategic point of view. Brazilian land is the land closest to Africa of any land in this hemisphere. The distance from the easternmost point of Brazil to Dakar is approximately half the distance between the eastern seaboard of the United States and Europe. It was essential that America obtain bases in Brazil and obtain the friendship of the Brazilian Government. Now it happened that at the time of Pearl Harbor the Brazilian Government was a dictatorship cast in the worst fascist mould, since the motives of its dictator, Getulio Vargas, can only be described as motives of personal aggrandizement, with none of the real if perverted patriotism of the European dictators. Hence it has been the policy of the United States — naturally enough—to soft-pedal the nature of the Vargas régime with which it was so essential to remain on good terms. As a consequence very few North Americans have any precise knowledge of recent Brazilian history or of Brazil's dictator.

Vargas came to power in 1930 as a result of the first successful armed revolution in Brazilian history. In 1934 he was legally elected President by a popularly elected constituent assembly. Under the constitution he would have had to retire in 1938, since Brazilian presidents are allowed only to serve one term. This did not suit his purposes, and so he engineered a *coup d'état* on November 10, 1937, when, having incited his friends of the Brazilian fascist party, the "Integralistas," to revolt, he suppressed them and established what he called the "Estado Novo." By this maneuver Vargas eliminated from the scene *all* political parties, including those with whom he had formerly worked the most closely. There followed more than seven years of absolute dictatorship, with Brazil's political leaders either in jail, in exile, or keeping very quiet. Up until Pearl Harbor Vargas was openly sympathetic to the European dictatorships and openly hostile to Russia, communism and the democracies. The United States, by means of its great wealth and economic power, succeeded in obtaining from Vargas everything it needed after its entrance into the war; moreover the United States possessed at that time a great measure of popular sympathy, so that by acceding to American requests, Vargas was for the time being able to solidify his position internally. Yet his régime has consistently indulged in anti-United States propaganda, attempting to persuade the Brazilian people that the great economic assets obtained from the United States—such as the vast iron and steel works at Volta Redonda—were entirely to be attributed to Vargas's "strong totalitarian government" whose genius was clever enough to obtain so magnificent a gift from a decadent democracy.

As time went on, Brazilians more and more turned against Vargas. Several bloody suppressions of student manifestations helped greatly to solidify popular discontent. And so, some months ago, Vargas announced that on December 2, 1945, elections would be held for the presidency. This concession came after a number of events had made clear that Brazilians overwhelmingly desired democracy. The first of these was the restoration of freedom of the press in February of this year. This was accomplished, quite obviously, by means of joint action on the part of the newspapers, although we do not yet know precisely how they managed it. On February 22, Rio de Janeiro's *Correio da Manha* printed an interview with José Américo de Almeida, former candidate for the presidency in the (never held) 1938 elections. This interview was published in violation of the censorship regulations, since it was highly critical of Vargas, and it caused a tremendous stir. The result was the collapse of the DIP (Departamento de Imprensa e Propaganda), though here again we do not know pre-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cisely the sequence of events. In any case, the Brazilian press ever since then has been obviously unshackled and is constantly critical of the régime, with the exception, of course, of newspapers belonging to the government.

Thenceforward there came a rapid succession of popular victories: the granting of habeas corpus, followed by amnesty for political prisoners; the promise that elections would be held and the preparation of an electoral code; the legalizing of political parties and a complete overhauling of the DIP, which now is not supposed to have any control over the press.

★

The first move of all the groups opposing Vargas was to agree upon their candidate for the presidency. Their choice was a brigadier general in the air force, Eduardo Gomes, a national hero known to possess great personal integrity and idealism and also having high prestige in the army. It should be explained that throughout Brazil's history there has been a strong republican and democratic tendency within the armed forces. The army is democratically recruited from among the masses of the people, and the tradition of its officer corps is strongly republican, at least among the lower grades and to some extent among general officers. The same may be said of the Brazilian Catholic clergy, among whom reactionary tendencies have displayed themselves only in rare instances, and then more with occasional Bishops than with the lower clergy. Indeed the bloodless overthrow of the Brazilian imperial dynasty was largely an achievement of the Church and the Army. There was need for a man strong enough to unite all the opposing currents, so it was natural that the opposition to Vargas should seek its candidate in the armed forces.

This opposition, organized in the União Democratica Nacional, at once formulated a program to which Air-Brigadier Gomes is completely committed. This program includes a full Bill of Rights, administrative decentralization, economic reform of a mildly socialist variety, free labor unions with the full right to strike, fiscal reform, social security, and international collaboration. Brazil has for over a century had a deeply democratic tradition, especially on the social level. It has never drawn any color line, and the relations between races and classes have always been cordial. But in the past voting has been limited to adult males who could read and write, and since the population is approximately 70 percent illiterate, those entitled to vote have constituted only a small fraction of the people. Gomes proposes to extend the suffrage by eliminating any literacy test—a wise measure, since literacy in itself is no guarantee of political wisdom. Here also is an indication of the genuine democracy of the UDN and its presidential candidate.

Vargas at once reacted to the nomination of Gomes by attempting to split the armed forces through the nomination as his candidate of his own Minister of War, General Eurico G. Dutra. As far as one can judge, this maneuver was largely intended to gain time, and Dutra was not supposed to view his candidacy seriously. But Dutra did not fall in with the scheme and has been hard at work campaigning on his own behalf. So far he is still the governmental candidate, but Vargas's support is notably cool.

Meanwhile it would seem that Vargas's real ally is a man who is not running for any office, but who is conducting the most active campaign of all. This is the head of the Communist Party, ex-Captain Luiz Carlos Prestes, dubbed the "Knight of Hope." As a result of the amnesty extended to political prisoners, Prestes was set free from ten years servitude in jail. He had there suffered the most cruel hardships and undergone the most degrading tortures. His German-born wife was delivered to the Gestapo by the Rio police and died in a German concentration camp. His young daughter, born abroad, was not allowed to return to Brazil when her mother died and had to live with Prestes's mother in exile in Mexico.

Despite all this, and presumably in accordance with the then prevalent Communist Party line, Prestes seems to have been in contact with Vargas even before he was released from prison. On various occasions previously the Communist Party had given sporadic support to the dictatorship in accordance with a tortuous policy which benefitted no one except the dictator himself—a policy of pseudo-nationalism directed largely against the United States. In any case, although Vargas had stated that only Congress could grant amnesty to political prisoners, he himself actually granted it and in so doing favored Prestes above all. Everything indicates that the whole business was arranged by negotiation while Prestes was still in prison.

No sooner had the communist leader been liberated than he began to give his full support to the dictatorship, and it was not long before he made public statements advocating a United Front with Vargas as its leader. The dictator himself has made several utterances sympathetic to and supporting the Communist Party, which today enjoys almost official privileges, with substantially no limits imposed on its propaganda activities, carried on through public meetings, over the radio, in newly-founded newspapers and by means of sound-trucks and automobiles. No one knows where the money is coming from to finance all this. Whoever personally experienced the political atmosphere of 1937, the time of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vargas's *coup d'état*, when up to the last minute Vargas and the Integralistas were going hand-in-hand, can bear witness to the fact that the atmosphere today is precisely the same if only one substitutes the word *communismo* for *integralismo*.

What this portends precisely it is hard to say. Perhaps Vargas thinks he can play the same trick twice—instigate a communist uprising, which he will then suppress and will use as an excuse for not holding elections in December. Or perhaps he will follow the line which Prestes himself has suggested—reorganizing his government so that it will include communists and then refusing to hold elections on the ground that the country is not ready for them. In any case the whole political situation is confused, since we find the communists openly allied with the dictatorship, while the dictatorship's official candidate for the presidency finds his principal support in certain army garrisons, principally in Rio, and in unimportant political circles.

On June 16 the first mass rally on behalf of Air-Brigadier Gomes's candidacy was held in Sao Paulo. Forty thousand persons are reported to have been present—a very large crowd by Brazilian standards—and the speakers included Arthur Bernardes, a former president of the republic, ex-president Júlio Prestes (*not* the communist leader), José Américo de Almeida, Octávio Mangabeira, former foreign minister. The conclusion of Gomes's own speech, which received praise throughout the Brazilian press, asserted his dedication to democratic ideals:

> These are the terms on which I have faith in the future. I believe in the victory of the people against oppression. I believe in the supreme power of ideals, especially when there dawns upon the world an opportunity for individuals as well as nations to sacrifice themselves for those ideals—individuals and nations who would rather die than live without ideals. I believe that freedom is compatible with order. I believe in the evolution of social justice, that economic inequality may be diminished or even abolished. I believe above all in the prestige and strength of juridically established régimes, under which the will of the government as well as the will of the governed is based upon and limited by law; under which, protected by the law, private initiative, industry and labor may feel safe and achieve the benefits of peace, freedom and security, extended to all men.

★

Brazil's political situation is complex. That Vargas actually intends another *coup d'état* seems especially likely in view of the recent declaration of war against Japan, the effect of which was supposedly to please the United States, but actually to prolong a state of war, under which elections might be made very difficult through the re-establishment of censorship, restrictions on the freedom of the people and police pressure. Up until now Prestes has favored the proletariat's cooperating with "progressive" members of the bourgeoisie, and he is willing to accept private property and private profits. He has said that he believes the December election to be premature, and that what is needed is to set up an organization of "large committees at working places, on streets, and in city districts," to be drawn gradually together in order that these may eventually constitute "the democratic, popular organizations in each town, area and state, up to the great national union," all this to be accomplished under a dictatorship strengthened by "men of popular prestige." All this, of course, is very similar to the Communist Party line we have until recently seen operating in the United States. Is it not possible that the line in Brazil may also change?

In any case, with the intentions of Vargas and Prestes uncertain, and with Generals Dutra and Gomes campaigning on the assumption that elections will be held in December, the all important factor is the state of Brazil's economy.

Brazil's economic life is completely disorganized, and it is reported that agricultural production has virtually ceased. There is a shortage of all foods unparalleled in the country's history. What was at one time the world's greatest producer of coffee is now threatened with seeing her most salable product disappear from the world market—precisely that product which was the very basis of her foreign trade. This terrible falling-off in agricultural activity has been largely brought about through a reckless building boom in the cities, connected with the war effort. Farm workers have been drawn to the cities to become building workers.

The cost of living has increased tremendously, being approximately double or treble what it was before the war. Thus the popular standard of living is lower than ever, with the usual concomitants of hunger and misery. An inflation of terrible proportions has started, making life almost impossible since there is no workable relationship between wages and living costs. Against all this the Vargas government has done nothing; on the contrary, paper currency is ceaselessly being printed and the régime has lost all control over Brazil's financial life. The public debt has jumped from three billions to approximately fifteen.

As everyone knows, such an economic situation can easily lead to a political explosion. Hence any prediction of what will take place during the next six month of Brazil's history is impossible. We can only be certain of one thing—the vast majority of politically conscious Brazilians, be they conservatives, liberals or socialists, Catholics or unbelievers, desires a change, and the only way in which Vargas can retain power is by force.

★

Citizens of the United States should also realize that for the first time in history this same majority of Brazilians is inclined to be unfriendly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

toward the United States. The Vargas régime has been consistently anti-North American in its propaganda; Prestes and his communists follow the same line. The opponents of both, who desire a democratic government, resent the way in which Washington has bolstered Vargas's power. In February of this year the first Brazilian Writers' Congress was held. One of the most important statements delivered to this Congress was written by Carlos Lacerda, a brilliant young Brazilian intellectual of Leftist tendencies. This statement dealt with what Lacerda calls "confidence in democracy" as it affects Brazilian-American relations. Lacerda in raising the questions he does speaks for all Brazilian democrats.

Lacerda stated that Brazilian-American relations had passed through three distinct phases. The first he calls the period "of watchful waiting, when all of us counted on the results of the contact between American democracy and Brazilian reality." But the seeds of disillusionment already existed at this early point. What Lacerda and his compatriots peculiarly resent is a certain "feeling of racial superiority regarding the enjoyment of liberty by Anglo-Saxon peoples." They feel that Americans who speak English "have established a downward scale for the enjoyment of the benefits of political and social progress. First, North Americans should enjoy freedom. Then the English. Then the French, in less degree, and the Spanish still less but perhaps slightly more than the Italians. The Portuguese, of course, don't matter. And afterward come South Americans in general—a charming enough people, but quite incapable of attaining the necessary maturity for the balanced enjoyment of civic liberties."

Lacerda's second period is one "of frank collaboration between two incompatible worlds—the world of liberty and the world without liberty. This collaboration developed . . . as a military necessity."

The final period is the period of squandering: "squandering dollars, adjectives and cocktails, in order to reconcile the irreconcilable, forget the unforgettable and disguise the undisguisable. It created a kind of South American 'Bovarism' wherein communities—like Madame Bovary—sighed for the lights of the Capital and the White House while they wearied away monotonous evenings in the political provinces . . ."

Lacerda feels that "there is a permanent contradiction in American-Brazilian relations, with two opposing sides, two diverging roads. The one is that of confidence and agreement, the other that of doubt and hesitation." As an example of the latter, Lacerda particularly points to "the policy of dealing with dictatorships, of mollifying and bribing them even in the name of the principle of self-determination and of the Good Neighbor Policy, as though to finance a dictatorship were not a form of intervention in the internal affairs of the subjugated nation, by retarding the democratization of the country's judicial and social order. . . . Because of this policy the United States has spent many million dollars in South America, in order to buy a friendship and confidence *which it would have obtained gratis,* and which it could have consolidated with the aid of men sincerely confident in the inevitable democratic future of the Latin American nations. Rather than diplomatic maneuvers, sometimes too clever to be sincere, there should prevail in the Department of State the example of those who believe in the will and capacity for fulfillment of the democratic forces in the sister-nations, in contrast to those who judge these countries' future by the authoritarian powers which may be dominant in some."

Lacerda clearly states that "the South American peoples would never ask the United States to intervene in order to restore democracy in their respective lands. This is a task for the people themselves and one which they would not relinquish." What he would like, as would every Brazilian, is that Americans cease listening to some of their representatives who tell them that Brazil is merely a vast extension of real estate, "where there is only one dominant being with whom they can negotiate in order to neutralize, induce, compel, lead and benumb." For, he says, "all these countries have in varying degrees a more permanent, sincere reality, one that is worthier of sympathy and confidence, and which—though often barely discernible and frequently sacrificed—remains unsubjugated, burning and alive." Lacerda ends with a brilliant peroration:

> It is this understanding of the need to sacrifice and participate in which we most resemble the United States at present. And the compromising with responsibility, the financing of lesser forms of fascism, the servility, the falsely practical and realistic expediency are what most displeases us in this pocket-size-Metternich trend in American diplomacy. One might say that for us the American eagle has two forms and is made of two different materials. One is a bronze eagle, with the weight and majesty of the noble material of which it is built. But the other is of paper, thin and perishable, as inferior and ridiculous as an *objet d'art* of *papier-mâché*.
>
> The majority of Brazilian writers expect the United States to move away from its collaboration with the dictatorships. Moreover, in the interest of continuing and constantly improving international relations, especially inter-American, they also expect the United States to let the people bring about, through their own efforts, the attainment of democratic processes in their respective countries, heretofore largely retarded through the collaboration of the American opportunist policy. For collaboration with the dictatorships means to us a conspiracy against the restoration of the juridical principle in the organization of the State and the democratic way of life in our South American countries. We see no impartiality of mind in this policy. Instead it works out as complicity. This is our opinion of the relations between the United States and Brazil. And we raise the question to this level in order

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that together we may save the sacred future of our friendship, the common work of our predecessors based on the principle that only free peoples understand each other in a lasting, useful way.

It is all the more regrettable, therefore, that Americans are not adequately informed as to what is going on in such a nation as Brazil, in order that they might have genuine sympathy with those who are working to restore to that country a reasonable and juridical régime.

I Don't Want to Go Back

An American girl of Japanese ancestry tells why

Ina Sugihara

THIS WAR'S creation, concentration camps, have in part been removed with the capitulation of Germany, but we still have America's "concentration camps"—those nine Relocation Centers in which Americans of Japanese descent, evacuated from the West Coast three years ago, continue to live.

Official announcement has been made that these camps will be disbanded by January 2, 1946, when the present Congressional appropriation runs out. This means that 65,000 men, women, and children—equivalent to one-half of Kansas City—must be absorbed by communities either in the West or in other parts of the country within six months. Each of the 65,000 faces three possibilities: go back to California, Washington, Oregon, or Arizona; start anew in the Middle West or the East; stay in camp until forced to leave.

Going back to the Pacific Coast, the only familiar territory these people know, would mean returning to that area where the very groups who initiated the evacuation, and other discriminatory measures, hold power. These forces now have a stronger weapon than that of public prejudice; they have a Supreme Court decision in their favor. That decision, in the Korematsu case last December, upholding the constitutionality of the evacuation, was a serious blow to civil liberties for everyone. By comparison, the revocation of evacuation orders by the Western Defense Command, effective January 2 of this year, permitting "loyal" Japanese Americans to return to the Coast, was not a real consolation.

The high court ruling gave federal sanction to the activities of Pacific Coast racists who originally wanted the Japanese Americans out of California because they were its chief independent farmers, producing 85 percent of the state's fruits and vegetables. Their competition was felt strongly by the Associated Farmers and the State Grange, California's monopoly and industrial agriculturists. The long-time campaign of these groups, together with that of the American Legion, the Native Sons and Daughters of the Golden West, the California State Committee on Naturalization and Immigration, the Asiatic Exclusion League, the McClatchy newspapers, and others, culminated in the evacuation.

These forces revealed their objectives when, following the mass removal, they advocated that evacuees be returned to the state during the war as tenant farmers and migrant laborers, thus reducing them again to the status of contract laborers from which the Japanese Americans had risen during past decades. They proved that "military necessity" had been an excuse.

Going back to California now to me would be like jumping into a witches' cauldron that had been bubbling for centuries. I would be powerless to stop the bubbling.

Students of Pacific Coast history are familiar with the long-standing organized discrimination which hovered over Oriental people almost from the time of their arrival, starting with the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1882 (now repealed), then the San Francisco school segregation campaign in 1908, the California Alien Land Act of 1921, and the general Asiatic Exclusion Acts of 1924. To this series we can now add the evacuation of 1942 and other bad measures in 1950, 1965, et cetera, unless a nationwide movement is organized to prohibit any brand of "manufactured prejudice" against any group of people.

Because of this background of planned discrimination, an insidious prejudice exists in all Pacific Coast communities. A minority is free from it, but the vast majority follow biased thinking with regard to "Oriental" people. Scarcely a person in that region believed that the evacuation was not necessary.

Whenever I think of California, I see blue-green hills behind wavy roads, towering eucalypti, and the Campanile on the Berkeley campus, the magnificent, swinging San Francisco Bay Bridge a string of lights reaching out into the night, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miles and miles of white sandy beaches stretching from San Diego to Santa Barbara, and the love and kindness of many good people whose hearts have no room for hate. But the moment the California I loved comes to mind, the state that initiated and promoted the evacuation of thousands of innocent men, women and children overshadows pleasant memories. I know that the fear and enmity instilled through years of anti-Oriental campaigns has not disappeared overnight. Residence ordinances stating, "Orientals can't live here," are still in effect. I could have few jobs outside of housework and selling apples. Living in that social climate as an individual, rather than as a social guinea pig, would be well-nigh impossible.

★

I can't forget the multitude of insults one met as an "Oriental" in the "Golden State." Every year hundreds of Japanese Americans and Chinese Americans were graduated from West Coast colleges. The following year they were doing housework, farming, selling fruits and vegetables in Los Angeles, or displaying curios in San Francisco's Chinatown.

The rebuffs I met from landlords, when entering the University of California as a junior and looking for a place to live, will forever stay in my mind. The people were courteous, but firm. Either the "vacancy" sign did not mean anything, or the rent was obviously too high for a student to afford. One particular incident, later in my college life, remains as a vivid example of the anomaly of prejudice. A girl friend, not an "Oriental," and I decided to move into an apartment together. I went to a renting agent who called a landlord about a listed vacancy. While she was talking on the phone, she asked me, "Are you Chinese or Japanese?"

"I am an American of Japanese descent," I said.

"And your friend . . .?"

"She is an American, too."

"Not Oriental?"

"No."

She repeated this information to the landlord and then gave the verdict: "Your friend can live there, but you can't—the apartment is suitable for two. Do you think your friend would be interested?"

My friend, being loyal to me and ideals, was not interested.

During my student boarding house days, the Berkeley city council almost passed a residential ordinance prohibiting "Orientals" from living in a wide area extending from the northern campus border to the city limits. If that ordinance had been passed, not only would I have had to move, but the Japanese American Men's and Women's Student Clubs would have had to transfer elsewhere their residential and social centers used by 400 to 500 people.

My experiences with employment discrimination also started while I was a student. The University of California faculty and administrators were for the most part not prejudiced, but the University Bureau of Occupations wanted to give me a job washing dishes, minding babies, and living in my employers' home. I insisted that I wanted to be an NYA typist and filing clerk. I was armed with a special request for my services from a college agency which had never before hired women on NYA. Finally, on my sixth or seventh daily visit, the NYA administrator, a woman, assigned me for a semester (most people were placed for a year at a time). This procedure was repeated every semester. The second time, I had to sign a statement promising not to accuse the administrator of discriminating racially nor come back again to renew my NYA status; the third time, the administrator re-assigned me without any questions saying, "I knew you'd be back"; and the fourth and last time, we were old friends.

When other Japanese American students learned that I was doing NYA work, they asked, "How'd you do it? No 'Oriental' has ever had such a job before—we've always done housework."

I also met Japanese American girls who said, "I have an NYA job this month. . . ."

"What do you mean—this month?" I asked.

"After that, I have to take a housekeeping job."

Fortunately, when I left the college, other Japanese American students had NYA jobs, and I realized that my efforts to obtain what I wanted for myself had indirectly benefitted others. My hope is that the Chinese American, Mexican American, Negro American, and Filipino American students still left are not suffering the same insults all over again.

★

Stories to tell my grandchildren will include the months of waiting I encountered after finishing at the university in 1941, when defense plants had drained most of California's available labor supply. I canvassed all employment agencies for miles around—and there were many in the San Francisco Bay region—including the segregated "Oriental Division" of the US Employment Service in San Francisco. I was never sent on an interview once during the ten months that I was around, except for housekeeping jobs and one offer from a labor union who wanted to use me to organize Oriental workers in its field.

This story will continue with the drudgery and incongruity of mopping floors, washing dishes,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and cooking other people's meals for a living, which I did for several months, while plenty of more creative jobs were going begging.

I was not quite old enough to have to fly to Reno to get married while I was in the West, but that was what I would have had to do if I had chosen a mate not an "Oriental," for California has a miscegenation law affecting "Orientals."

Because of California's Alien Land Act (1921), my parents, who are not allowed to become citizens, cannot own real estate there, not even a home in which to live during their declining years.

Theodore Roosevelt stopped segregation of "Oriental" children in San Francisco's schools in 1908, but this practice existed as late as 1940 in other communities. I met people who had been trained in "Oriental" sections of school districts, and their handicap through lack of cultural contact was apparent even when they had reached the university. It is true that I have met employment and housing discrimination in the East, but this to my mind is mostly a temporary ailment caused by war hysteria. Of course, some of it is not, but it at least is not a part of an organized campaign. That on the West Coast is a chronic sickness growing worse each year.

The East has proved its sincerity by opposing most of the West's anti-Oriental measures. Organizations in New York and elsewhere objected to both the Chinese and Asiatic Exclusion Acts. The only vocal opposition to the evacuation came from the East. Individuals and groups three years ago prevented the Eastern Defense Command from evacuating individuals, following the West Coast example.

Just as the Negro American who ventured North will not go back to Georgia, so the Japanese American who wants to live a normal life does not want to go back to California. The right to do so is important, but the practicality of the step is another matter.

★

I cannot see a brighter life for Japanese Americans on the West Coast than in earlier years. The American Legion and others are again on the march. Already they have voiced opposition to return of the "Japs." Mayor Fletcher Bowron of Los Angeles predicts clashes in former "Lil' Tokio" between returning Japanese Americans and the Mexican Americans, Negro Americans, and Chinese Americans who have moved in since the evacuation. He will be the last to prevent these conflicts, as demonstrated in the Zoot Suit Riot of 1943, when police arrested Mexican Americans and no others.

If Japanese Americans return in large numbers to Los Angeles's international ghetto, it will be the center of a multiple discrimination and "bigger and better" riots. No one will know who is directly at fault, but tighter restrictions in the rest of the community against all minority groups will crowd them into an extremely limited territory, and lack of privacy, together with the search for a scapegoat, will cause bloodshed.

Economic boycotts against farm produce of Japanese Americans are now effective in various parts of Oregon and California. We have heard of the many outbreaks of violence against returning evacuees and the "sleight of hand" justice given offenders. No, I don't want to go back to California. If doing so would mean a chance effectively to fight the industrial agriculturists who are determined to fan the breath of prejudice, I would be glad to start back today. But I know that a group as strong as theirs can be beaten only through an uncompromising national movement to eliminate their practices—a sincere effort by people who are not poisoned by the prejudice so prevalent in that area.

The "Oriental problem" is not a Pacific Coast one; though the West initiated it. It is now bigger and far more destructive than the evils existing in any one region alone. It is an American problem.

Communications

THE CHURCH AND THE "ISMS"

Mineola, N. Y.

TO the Editors: Father Cohalan surely will not have us believe that it was anything but a sectarian spirit, a "Church as Institution" complex, that was responsible for the soft-pedaling of the fascist danger by American Catholic leadership during the last twenty years. Not because of the crudity of the nazi myths, not because nazi particularism had no appeal outside of Germany, was fascism tolerated and ignored by American Catholicism, but because it did not at first threaten "our side." It attacked only the Jews. The Church could probably do business with it.

The "Church as Institution" viewpoint, as opposed to the "Church as Principle," is rooted in sectarianism and party spirit. It breeds among Catholics the fraternalism of the country club, it speaks of "our people" and "the others." It observes prudence and caution as long as "the others" are the only ones who are being persecuted: the others more or less deserve it.

Those who measure a social philosophy with the yardstick of "religion" oftentimes mean that they are judging it from the exclusive standpoint of its immediate effect upon the *status quo* and the power of the Church as Institution. This was surely the yardstick of American Catholic leadership in the twenties and thirties, when the evils of the fascist philosophy were soft-pedaled. To insist that the only unfettered yardsticks for the evaluation of social philosophies are Truth and Love, is no doubt tantamount to enrolment in the Society of Starry-Eyed Idealists.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Father Cohalan hopes that the leaders of American Catholic opinion will, "as ever in the past," follow the directives of the Holy See. It may not be amiss to point out here the *de facto* ineffectuality in the American Church of Papal leadership in the condemnation of anti-Semitism. Let us be specific. The prevalence in Boston, for example, of widespread anti-Semitism and—simultaneously—overwhelming and unchallengeable Catholic influence, is a disgraceful testament of the sectarianism of American Catholicism.

H. T. MAGUIRE.

Longview, Wash.

TO the Editors: It seems to me that the Reverend Florence D. Cohalan in the issue of June 22 entirely misses the point of H. T. Maguire's letter on "The Church and the 'Isms.'" The aim of a courageous condemnation of three immoral philosophies can hardly be the manifestation of "patriotic solidarity." Mr. Maguire as far as I can see reprimanded all and advocated no "soft-pedaling" for any reason. It will be of comparatively small importance in the ultimate adding up whether a Pope made an official and academic pronouncement against fascism and nazism. What will count is the practical condemnation of these "isms" in the thought and action of the children of the Church and especially on the part of those who are in a position of intellectual leadership. What is important and what has been lacking is a general "healthy Catholic instinct" which made Catholics recoil from everything totalitarian. One would expect this both from the directives of the Holy See and the whole fabric of Christian philosophy.

That departmentalism which separates religion and politics into separate and unrelated categories is hardly Catholic, and is precisely the attitude which has left contemporary politics almost completely untouched by Christian principle. Moreover, whether militant atheism is more thoroughly destructive of religion than an anti-Christian philosophy diametrically opposed to every fundamental Christian tenet, is at least open to question. Anyone who wishes to cling to a slender margin of difference is free to do so. The point is that all three totalitarian ideologies are essentially immoral and wrong through and through. Christians can brook no compromise with any, and should not soft-pedal their condemnation of one while peering under every bed for sight of another. Their reasons should not be pragmatic but should proceed simply from fidelity to truth and right.

Father Cohalan's emphasis on the particularism of the nazi creed impresses me as naïve. Is he unaware of nazi influence on Italy, Spain, Argentina and other South American republics, for example? It seems to me that the influence of nazi thought by means of war has been rather widespread and rather devastating, even more than the communist. As for the likelihood of sincere non-German converts to nazism, it is hardly the color of the uniform, the form of the symbol or even the kind of blood that are important. Rather is it racism of whatever variety, statism and militarism that are fundamentally and irreconcilably opposed to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and to the nature of man and human society. When Catholics are opposed instinctively to these things in any and every guise just because they are wrong, then we can thank God for a "healthy Catholic instinct."

THE REV. JAMES DEADY.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

TO the Editors: Readers of Father Cohalan's reply to H. T. Maguire might well recall his article of almost four years ago in THE COMMONWEAL, "Volunteer Pilots for Peter's Bark," as an example of soft-pedaling the fight against fascism. Also, the following symptoms that support Mr. Maguire's case:

(1) That it has always been easier to purchase the encyclical on communism than that on fascism, or even nazism; (2) that Father Gillis has borne witness that he received all sorts of insults and threats from the moment he began to write against Mussolini and fascism; (3) that many leading Catholics could have construed nazism and fascism as "defense-mechanisms" against communism only because they were blind to the dangers of the former ideologies; (4) finally, that Pope Pius XII himself pointed out recently that some Catholics in Germany did not heed the warnings of "Mit Brennender Sorge." The number of such increased in direct proportion with the distance from Berlin.

Furtherwore, Father Cohalan implies that those who oppose fascism are guilty of soft-pedaling the fight against communism. This is not true. Moreover, he forgets that Hitler's attack on Russia complicated the situation enormously. Until Russia makes an outright military move the means of combating communism must remain pacific and diplomatic. Or does Father Cohalan demand that right now we declare war on Russia to prove that we are not blind to the evils of communism?

THE REV. VINCENT A. BROWN.

DO WE REALLY NEED IT?

Washington, D. C.

TO the Editors: I have read with interest the editorial in the June 15 issue of THE COMMONWEAL, "Do We Really Need It?" It concerns our obligation to see that Europeans are fed in the interest of humanity and lasting peace. This is a subject that every American should consider earnestly and thoughtfully.

I was disturbed, however, that you credited OPA with having issued an order shutting off shipments of meat to Europe. This Office acts only as the rationing agent for the amount of civilian supplies which the supply agencies of the Government determine shall be allocated to civilians. It has no voice in deciding the amount apportioned to civilians, the armed services, or for shipment abroad. . . .

CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, OPA

RUSSIA

Chicago, Ill.

TO the Editors: It was kind of you to send us a marked copy of your paper of June 22, though hardly necessary because I generally see it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You appear to believe that *The Chicago Tribune* has been advocating war against Russia. That is not true. Though we have frequently denounced Stalin's theories and acts, we have said on numerous occasions of late that we are opposed to war against Russia. We have never at any time, directly or indirectly, expressed approval of such a war. I am enclosing our editorials of May 27 and June 1 for the light they throw on our position.

I agree with you that it would be inconsistent for anyone with a record of isolationism "to become mongers for war with Russia." That is precisely the point of our editorial of May 27, "The Communist Line."

I suggest that you have accepted as true, without verification, the false accusations directed by the Soviets against *The Tribune* and other American newspapers. You may well ask yourself why the Russian government is engaging in such a campaign of misrepresentation.

LEON STOLZ,
Chief Editorial Writer,
The Chicago Tribune.

We are glad to reprint the longer of the two editorials mentioned by Mr. Stolz in order that our readers may form their own opinion regarding the policy of the Chicago Tribune.—THE EDITORS.

The communists continue to howl against what they call the McCormick-Patterson press, by which they mean this newspaper, the New York *News,* and the Washington *Times-Herald.*

As usual, the commies' judgment is appallingly bad. The one thing their darling Russia has to fear above all else is a ganging up of the capitalist nations against her. There are a lot of influential people in England and some in this country who would like now to join such a lynching bee and, given a little time and a little propaganda, the sentiment could spread rapidly.

In these circumstances, the commies, if they had any sense, would be looking about them to discover who in this country could be counted upon not to be swept into this new crusade. If any such people could be found the commies ought to be doing all in their power to strengthen them.

It just so happens that there are such people, and conspicuous among them are what the commies call the McCormick-Patterson press. The New York *News* has said repeatedly of late that it can't see any sense in a war against Russia unless Russia attacks the United States, and if we haven't said the same thing it was only because our readers know we would oppose a Russian war with all the vigor at our command. We don't think enough good could come of it to justify the cost, or come anywhere near justifying it.

This is a matured judgment which no amount of propaganda is likely to change, as our record proves. We didn't admire the kaiser and we had no higher opinion of Hitler than we now entertain for Stalin, but when the war fever was rising all around us we didn't catch the contagion either time. This newspaper can't see what America has to gain by beating Russia that would be worth another million American casualties and the loss of two or three more years from the lives of 10,000,000 other boys, not to mention a couple of hundred billion dollars. There is nothing in the news from Europe or from San Francisco to persuade us that a victory over Russia would be worth what it would cost.

What's more, the propaganda for a war against Russia isn't going to inflame us, because nobody can tell us anything about the horrors of the bolshevik régime that we and our readers don't know already. We know all about Stalin's slave labor camps and the starvation and brutality in them, and we know that there are more victims behind Stalin's barbed wire today than Hitler ever had behind his. We know that what the Russians have done in the countries they have taken by force is all but identical with what Hitler did in the lands he conquered. We know that Molotov's diplomacy is the same compound of evasion and treachery that marked von Ribbentrop's career. We know that Stalin has betrayed and degraded the Russian people just as Hitler did the Germans.

This country went into the last two wars as England's ally, to the great satisfaction of the Anglophile press and the do-good press. The editors of those publications now profess to be friendly to Russia, but won't stay that way long if once the word goes out that England wants Russia stopped. Anything that England calls a crusade, they'll call a crusade, whether there's anything in it for America or not.

The Screen

Ninety in the Shade

AMAZING is the word for some of the concoctions that Hollywood thinks up as escapist entertainment. During these days when a tropical heat wave is likely to chase you into the nearest air-conditioned theater, it might be well to warn you about a few pictures. Here are a few that are distinctly escapist. However, when the thermometer is sizzling, many people select their movie palace for its coolth and not for what's on the screen. These houses used to give away dishes to attract customers; now they give away cold air. And just that, my dear children, is the trouble with the movies.

In glorious technicolor well suited to the rich plush interiors and turn-of-the-century costumes in San Francisco, *"Nob Hill"* tells the story of a Barbary Coast man (George Raft) who has aspirations to marry up on the hill where the swells live. He learns the hard way that classes don't mix; and he is glad to return to the shapely, red-headed singer (Vivian Blaine) whom he dropped for the wealthy and fashionable Miss Carruthers (Joan Bennett). Besides songs and can-can dances, politics are somehow involved in this plot, but nothing can be taken seriously. Basically it's just the old triangle stuff and pretty cliché at that. I have a vague idea I've seen it all before—and from the same studio, when Betty Grable and Alice Faye were singing and fighting over the boys. The main difference in this version is the presence of Peggy Ann Garner as a little Miss Fixit; her serious face and sincere acting are as out of place here as real gold in a box of Christmas tinsel.

"A Thousand and One Nights" is also in lush technicolor that befits its story—a 1945 version of an Arabian Nights tale complete with wise cracks, puns and Comedian Phil Silvers wearing glasses (even the harlequin kind in one scene). In this telling, Aladdin (played by Cornel Wilde who was a sensitive Chopin a few months ago) is a brash young man who dares to fall in love with a princess (Adele Jergens). Complications set in when the genie who pops out of his lamp turns out to be very attractive Evelyn Keyes who promptly falls for her master. The main trouble with this colorful extrava-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ganza is that its romance and adventure are designed for children and its humor is not. Or maybe it is.

I don't know for whom *"Bedside Manner"* was designed. It's the frothiest bit of unfunny fluff to turn up in a long time. Its story attempts to make light of doctoring, a profession that does not particularly lend itself to humor. And its theme, in which a female doctor (played by Ruth Hussey in a series of very tricky hats) is fooled by a test pilot (John Carroll) to get her attentions, left me cold. The slapstick and the rough treatment John gets when Ruth is wise to him would make Hippocrates shudder. Me too.

"Those Endearing Young Charms" may have had an idea when Jerome Chodorov first wrote his play, but I doubt it, for he was also the script-writer for the movie which is completely muddled and silly. It has something to do with a naïve girl (Laraine Day) who falls for a command pilot (Robert Young) who is a wolf in officer's clothing. The girl's mama (Ann Harding) is suspicious of this handsome lieutenant—and very rightly. But it seems that mama turned down a man like that in the last war, and has regretted it ever since. Jerry, the son of that man whom mama refused, is now in love with Laraine and when he sees that the lieutenant's intentions are not strictly honorable, he takes a sock at the lieutenant. This is bad, for although the lieutenant is a wolf with a girl in every airport, he is also Jerry's superior officer. Just why Laraine gives a second thought to the blasé lieutenant when she could have Jerry (who is played with honest simplicity and greater charm by newcomer Bill Williams) is not so clear. After an awful lot of talk, mama decides the lieutenant is OK; and the finale shows Laraine promising to wait. No doubt this static, verbose movie is trying to say something, but I'm not sure what—unless it is that Laraine should have left mama and started thinking for herself a long time ago.

Then, there are a couple of movies coming up soon about people who pretend they are married in order to fool their employers and various other people. The complications that arise in these two movies are similar, so it is difficult to explain why I sat glumly at one and laughed uproariously at the other. *"Christmas in Connecticut"* has an artificial quality and works so hard at being funny that it almost becomes pedestrian. Barbara Stanwyck portrays a popular columnist on a woman's magazine. Since she has written about her house in the country, her baby and culinary art so often, her editor insists that she show them off to the magazine publisher (Sydney Greenstreet) and a war hero (Dennis Morgan) who come for the holidays. So Barbara and a suitor (Reginald Gardiner), who conveniently has a picturesque house in Connecticut, pretend they are man and wife. A borrowed baby cooperates in the plot which grows thicker and sillier when the publisher wants the couple to have a second child because "babies boost circulation." Needless to say there are plenty of contrived bedroom and kitchen scenes (Barbara *cannot* cook) before matters are finally straightened out and Barbara and the soldier fall into each other's arms. The women in the audience giggled a lot over all this phony business.

I suppose the plot of *"Guest Wife"* is just as thin and ridiculous; but the picture, due to Sam Wood's fast direction and nice light touches, and the amusing lines by Scriptwriters Bruce Manning and John Klorer, becomes a gay item with audience appeal regardless of the weather. Furthermore it is very well acted by a cast who know that a sophisticated little comedy should be played with bright spirit. In this case, Claudette Colbert reluctantly pretends she is the wife of the visiting correspondent (Don Ameche) who is a very good friend of her husband (Richard Foran). In fact, Claudette is so fed up with this Damon-and-Pythias friendship that started in college where Richard played tackle and Don carried the ball, that she decides to teach her husband a lesson. She registers an enthusiasm in acting as Don's wife that upsets both of the boys. And in the following episodes, which are full of fun, slapstick and harmless innuendo, Claudette teaches Don to stick to his writing business and Dick to carry the ball. PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

Too Many Loaves, Too Many Mouths

JAMES RORTY

THE SCOPE of this fascinating symposium,* consisting of papers read at the Twentieth Institute of the Harris Foundation, is as vast as the title indicates, and if it has a fault, it is that it is not vast enough. Not all the experts on food and related matters were there, and not quite everything was said.

Hugh Bennett, father of the conservation movement was not there, and one wonders why not. Likewise, why no ecologist, no anthropologist such as Margaret Meade, Secretary of the Food Habits Committee of the National Research Council, no consumption economist such as Donald Montgomery, Consumers Counsel of the UAW-CIO, no representative of the Consumers' Cooperative movement—Murray Lincoln should at least have been in the gallery—no expert on political pressure groups, no student of what has happened to our modern instruments of social communication? It might have helped, too, if some of the villains of the drama had been there to express themselves in person: for example, Ed O'Neal of the Farm Bureau, or a politician like Senator Bankhead.

Then, out of that richer dissonance, somebody might have ventured to strike the resolving major chord of the international "action program" for which the world is waiting—hungrily enough in all conscience.

On the other hand, maybe not. Maybe we must pass through a few more totalitarian and/or democratic purgatories before we are able to synthesize our thinking, let alone our collective international action.

Meanwhile this symposium represents a remarkably able and honest if inconclusive effort directed at what is perhaps the most acute of all the numerous and inescapable problems of international planning with which our "one world" is faced. The book is, or should be, "must" reading for all students of food and nutrition and for all who concern themselves with planning of any kind.

*Food for the World. Edited by Theodore W. Schultz. Chicago. $3.75.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fact that despite current and expected mass starvation in Europe and Asia the Harris lecturers concerned themselves chiefly with *agricultural surpluses*—too many loaves, as well as too many mouths—is only one of the many unhappy paradoxes that are contained in our national and international food dilemma. Here are just a few of them.

(1) The more we support agricultural prices, the more we tend to wither the international market, not only for food, but for everything else, with consequent pinching first of our domestic consumers and ultimately of our farmers too.

(2) The first effect of giving a semi-starved population enough to eat—by improving the agricultural technology of China or India for example—is to increase an already menacing population upcurve, thereby renewing the Malthusian pressure on the rising level of production. For example, Dr. Notestein expects the population of the Soviet Union (excluding its recent annexations and satellite nations) to exceed 250 million by 1970, at which time our own population, now in the stage of incipient decline, will have leveled off at about 160 million.

(3) The planning of our food economy on its indivisible national and international levels must, like any other kind of planning, be consumer-oriented. In the words of the conservative economist Karl Brandt, "The attainment of tangible results in an international food policy will require that the consumer should by his sovereign act of buying food, issue the order for production through the medium of price and at the same time obey the order of price through his own dispositions." One would not question the theoretical correctness of this position. But is there enough vitality left in the price system to accomplish the admittedly necessary consumer-orientation of planning? When Dr. Brandt bugles a reveille to the "sovereign" consumer, all that happens is that a poor old Throttlebottom rises feebly above the grave to which monopoly capitalism has consigned him, but is scarcely able, at this late date, to assemble the elements necessary to effective economic and political assertion. Unless, of course, the co-ops can accomplish the Lazarus-miracle—but as already noted the co-ops were seemingly regarded as of too little importance to be represented in this symposium. Murray Lincoln and other consumer representatives should have been there to point out that today the consumer's "sovereign acts" are pretty much the resultants of the combined pressure of social mores, of conditioned appetite, including commercially fostered addictions like candy bars and the cola drinks, and of the commercial pressures of salesmanship and advertising in general.

One curious aspect of the discussion as it developed was that not even the more conservative economists really expect the consumer to be able to run the show, any more than they expect it to operate automatically under the drive of the "free" market. Even Dr. Brandt worried openly lest the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations degenerate into "an agricultural racket," serving merely to transfer self-defeating producer pressures to the international arena. The net of the paradox, of which all the participants in the discussions showed themselves aware, is that the consumer, who should set the objectives and the measures of planning, is politically ineffectual, whereas the producer, who shouldn't, is politically overwhelming.

(4) Is nutrition a science? Yes. Then, if we are to be scientifically nourished who should tell us what to eat? The nutritionist, of course, since he is the scientist and the decision is a scientific one. Scientific feeding is in fact the rule with respect to pigs and chickens which have a market, or at least a price-supported value. But when the Food and Nutrition Board came to set up a nutritional yardstick for human beings, one of its weakest points, in the opinion of Colonel John B. Youmans, was that it was arrived at by *democratic,* rather than strictly scientific process. "It is to be doubted," remarks Colonel Youmans testily, "whether any scientific question should be settled on the basis of a democratic process." Right. The majority is always wrong, as Ibsen pointed out long ago. But the majority rules democratically in this country. Or does it? Turning back a few pages we find a rueful observation by Dr. Robert Griggs, of the National Research Council, to the effect that the OPA asked the advice of the Food and Nutrition Board about sugar rationing, and the Board's scientists rendered their august scientific opinion, *and the OPA gave it no mind whatever.* Neither, it would seem, did the Navy, or especially Colonel Youman's Army.

With respect to sugar consumption, the decision was made neither by a scientific nor a democratic process, but by the process of power-politics in which minority pressure groups express themselves politically, *and unscientifically,* but effectively; as for example when Eleanor Roosevelt and Quarter Master General Gregory appeared on a heavily sugared network broadcast sponsored by the National Confectioners' Association. As a result of this undemocratic and unscientific decision we civilians during this war have been eating nearly four times as much sugar per capita as the nutritionists think is good for us, while the Army has been eating nearly seven times what would be considered a scientific ration.

As for the Navy, science, in the person of Dr. Clive M. McKay, formerly of the Cornell School of Nutrition, has been earnestly trying to reduce the consumption of Coca-Cola and other sugary cola drinks in the ship canteens, while democracy, as represented by the managers of the canteens, which split their profits with the gobs, has been just as earnestly telling Dr. McKay to go sit on a tack. This, although Dr. McKay by some recent tests has shown that Harvey W. Wiley was right a generation ago when he denounced the deleteriousness of Coca-Cola; it seems that in addition to diluting the diet with too much sugar it contains enough phosphoric acid to etch the teeth of Dr. McKay's rats. These findings appear in the current issue of the *Journal* of the American Dental Association and in a release issued by *Science Service,* which for some reason, probably neither democratic nor scientific, no newspaper in New York or Chicago found fit to print. But presumably science in the person of Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of the *Journal* of the American Medical Association, has noted Dr. McKay's findings and will promptly cancel the Journal's advertising contract with the Coca-Cola Company. Want to make a bet on it?

The paradox of too many mouths and too many loaves might, conceivably, have been clarified by the addition to the symposium of a few conservationists and ecologists. I felt this lack strongly when I read the statement by Dr. Theodore W. Schultz, the able editor of the symposium, that the current technological revolution in agriculture is increasing production so fast that by 1950 we may expect four million of our farms to produce a third more than did six million farms before the war. But do we want

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two million fewer farms? Does science say so, or is it merely the mechanical drift of the technological continuum under monopoly capitalism? Within what framework of human values does science view this drift? Would not the ecologists tell us that here again we run the danger of egoistically and self-defeatingly asserting "man's mastery over nature," instead of directing our planning toward defining and securing man's proper and permitted place in the total natural ecology of soil, plants, animals and man?

Ultimately the planners of plenty for the world are obliged, as are some of the contributors to this symposium, to confront basic philosophic problems and to seek moral and spiritual sanctions. No matter by what path the problem is approached, it becomes clear that we can at once cherish the good earth and use the modern technology to enhance its fruitfulness only if in all good faith and on a global scale we do become our brothers' keepers; not excepting the Hottentot who needs, not exactly a quart of milk a day, but perhaps a blooded sire for his herds; and the Chinese who want conservation experts and machines, but without an imperial price tab; and all the others who must surely drag us down unless we lift them up.

Easily the best parts of the book are the discussions which conclude each of its sections. Dr. Schultz has edited wisely and not too much, so that the experts win our respect by their forthrightness and courage as well as by their ability.

More Books of the Week

They Seek a City. Arna Bontemps and Jack Conroy. Doubleday. $2.75.

THE Indians are said to have called Jean Baptiste Point Du Sable, swarthy, Catholic, French in culture and unmistakably a Negro, "the first white man in Chicago." There is now a Du Sable club among colored people, a Du Sable street, and a Du Sable high school on the South Side in the heart of the black belt. The original owner of that name might have come from Canada, New France in Louisiana, or his family might have stemmed out of old France. But he was the first known representative of European civilization to settle among the Indians around Chicago in 1779, peacefully seeking trade, building his family, engaging in political deals with the Indians against the Americans, against the British, the owner of some trite works of "art" which marked him as an unusual man. That was a long time ago in Negro American history.

The writers have brought us a much improved approach along literary lines to the study of the Negro in American life. Their gift to us is a book without a philosophic base, apparently; certainly in the sense of American "race-ology." They have unearthed much new material, have rewritten some that is old, and in general have helped present a new point of view on Negro life and culture. There is very little straining, although the sufferings of the Negro are made to account for perhaps far more human weaknesses than we ought to make excuses for.

It is not for the reviewer to give too much on the "whys" and so forth, inasmuch as the main struggle right now is to gain for Negroes straightforward recognition of human values without bogging them down with

B. ALTMAN & CO.

FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK

Rush Rugs

MADE UP FROM 22-in. SQUARES

each 50c

perfect for outdoors . . . indoors, too. Natural-color rush that goes with any color set-up. Any size in even feet . . . you name it. Heavy, durable, reversible, long-wearing. Note: any size can be made to your order. For example, here are the three most wanted sizes:

8x10 ft.,	**40.00**
9x12 ft.,	**54.00**
10x15 ft.,	**75.00**

fifth floor

out-of-town customers—write us your individual requirements, you'll get prompt service. Shipping charges additional outside our motor delivery area.

mail and phone (MU. 9-7000) filled

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

race pseudo-science, glib talk about social conflicts, etc. The authors are not totally free from errors of interpretation. This becomes obvious when they write in the ballyhoo of present-day radical groups as if these brave things are actually done or attempted as written. So, whether it is the eviction heroics of Chicago during the depression, or the labor heroics of young Negroes getting their feet wet in labor's blood and their ideas banged about by experience, our writers do best with plain research, holding to the past, and leaving the present to future writers who will see drab history in appropriately drab terms. In short, where the authors are not too earnest in writing history from present-day pamphlets, they are at their best.

Too few Americans know that the Negro has a history written in brave deeds. It did not take friendly whites to start the great exoduses from the backward South. (It took the friendly whites to make easier adjustments in a hostile North.) But the general belief that whites have always been on hand to give the backwoods Negroes the first lessons in leaving their land of sorrow is simply not true. The fact is, there has frequently been inspired leadership on hand in a crisis, and a leadership that is not pampered and not subsidized in a poorly disguised effort to corrupt.

There are many forgotten names in this book. Few Negro youths, even, know anything about Jim Beckworth, the mulatto adventurer who lived and fought with the Crow Indians in Missouri and Kansas. Almost nobody pays attention to Carter Woodson's research: 2,255 Negroes in Cincinnati owning buildings rented to whites in 1840, and so on. Or, that Ida B. Wells, a Negro woman newspaper editor was driven from Memphis, Tennessee, at the age of twenty-three. By the time she was twenty-five she had been to England crusading against lynching, "recognized as the most implacable and most effective enemy of mob rule."

Friends of the Negro might know the part played by the Chicago *Defender,* the famous weekly that stimulated the migration of Negroes into Chicago during the last world war, but nothing of the great Negro physician, Dr. Andrew Springs; and many others who are seldom talked about. The reader should top it off with the story of Adah Isaacs Menken, buried a Jew, born a Negro, lover of freedom, who succeeded in "passing" from colored to white, and back again, with her lovers and admirers none the wiser for the trick. It all comes in an effort to find a resting place. "They Seek A City" is the sort of book that Negroes must get in the blood again. It is still possible that we can save the race from a philosophy of despair.

GEORGE STREATOR.

The American Revolution And Its Influence on World Civilization. Robert R. McCormick. Chicago Tribune. $1.00.

AMONG the numberless mistakes Colonel McCormick has made since becoming editor and publisher of the Chicago *Tribune,* writing this book is perhaps the worst.

It is an attempt to portray the impact of the American Revolution upon the world as though it were an event that had no roots in history and was unrelated to the great changes that had already occurred in England, or to the mood that was so soon to break forth in the French Revolution.

The thesis seems to be that America sprang into existence suddenly, wholly pure, rising somehow out of the stinking mess which was and is, according to McCormick, the rest of the world. His chief venom is, as usual, reserved for the British against whom the last two chapters are directed. Luckily they are so ridiculous that they can do little harm.

History, to the author, apparently consists of a series of totally unrelated events. Perhaps that explains why he thinks that it can be adequately recorded in a book by means of totally unrelated paragraphs.

WILLIAM AGAR.

The Rebirth of Liberation Education. Fred B. Millett. Harcourt. $2.00.

IN THIS book, Mr. Millett presents a careful analysis of a large number of more or less well-known liberal arts college programs, to which he gave several months study at the request of the Rockefeller Foundation. St. John's is omitted (wisely in view of the speculative problems involved), and, less understandably, Columbia and even Harvard (which, I am told, has also been doing something to keep itself youthful). Nevertheless this is a book which will be much read by men now wearily sitting on college curriculum committees. For Mr. Millett himself is almost the type of the contemporary educator: earnest, tolerant, reflectively practical, ready to experiment and aware of far more problems than he has philosophy with which to solve them. Moreover, he is, like most professors of the humanities today, deeply perturbed by the difficulty of teaching without having anything to teach—anything, that is, on which all the faculty can agree.

Mr. Millett also has the limitations of the typical professor. Thus, among the common academic prejudices he more or less consciously falls into is that of the opposition between the humanities and the sciences and the curious view that the humanities have to do with an incoherent and unscientific thing called value. In short he has not visited St. John's nor carefully read Mr. Mark Van Doren's "Liberal Arts." Secondly, Mr. Millett fails to see or at least to show that survey courses *necessarily* falsify, because they are necessarily superficial and because the mind is not thereby disciplined to *receive* the truth. It is an appalling thing that neither Mr. Millett nor most of the hundreds of professors engaged in the courses he here describes can distinguish intelligently between the *matter* of a course and its *formative* value. The liberal arts are as little understood as if Mr. Hutchins and Mr. Adler, Mr. Barr and Mr. Mark Van Doren had never spoken. Why indeed teach history? Why glance at the hundred great snippet? Why do a project on "Our Western Culture"? If these questions had to be answered, most of the colleges so patiently and sympathetically described by Mr. Millett would have to drop the pretense of giving a liberal education.

The ultimate and depressing implication of such a survey as this, however, is that our middle classes are intellectually bankrupt and morally adrift—and know it. The fact is that only the laboring classes now have anything like a common moral and philosophic view of their lives and therefore of the intellectual discipines relevant to them. I suspect that anyone now looking for a liberal education would have better luck with the California School of Labor in San Francisco than in the great and buzzing University of California (to use illus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trations with which I am somewhat familiar—there are equivalents in the East). The reason being that such a school does not yet have to invent its (serious) purposes in teaching non-utilitarian subjects. Almost all other schools do. Mr. Millett shows this, though I hasten to add that he does not say it. In a gray, unhappy way, for his instincts are right, he himself still has some hope for education.

At the same time, and paradoxically, we would not be made aware of this vacuum if the academic world were not groping away from the anarchistic and positivistic conception of science in the nineteenth century toward some new social and political orthodoxy of the future. And perhaps, considered in this light, we have some reason to congratulate ourselves on the philosophical immaturity of the American professoriate. Clear ideas, if false, would be far more tyrannous, though also more stimulating than those of a survey course. LEO CAMP.

The Asian Legacy and American Life: Essays arranged and edited by Arthur E. Christy. Illustrated. John Day. $3.50.

THE purpose of this book is to show not only what the East has given the West but more important, what the East can still give the West. While similar to the Oxford Legacy series, this volume examines the Orient's specific contribution, past and potential, to American life. The officials and scholars who contributed the articles on music, art, agriculture, missions and other organizations, poetry, transcendentalism, religion and philosophy, are all men to quote Dr. Christy, "who agree on only one principle, namely, that intercultural exchange involves more than the commodities or bric-a-brac which cross the oceans on the bottoms of ships, the records compiled by attachés in consular offices overseas, and trade treaties favored by chambers of commerce." Their stress has been on processes and values which politicians and economists generally ignore, with the aim of awakening the American public to a comprehensive view of all that is involved in our relations with non-European peoples.

Since 1900 the Western musical world has become increasingly conscious of the limitations of its devices, and has turned admiring ears to the richness of modes of Eastern music. From the Japanese print-maker, via France, stems the best of our present poster work. Thanks to India zebu hybrid cattle graze Southern Texas, on pastures too hot for our native breeds. China's soy bean has become the United States' fifth or sixth largest crop. Theosophy and other Eastern cults are winning adherents in more cities than Los Angeles. But it is the East's way of life which may yet be her greatest contribution to our culture, her contempt for materialism, and the high value she places on the simple gifts of life, on good family life, and pleasant community fellowship and on all human relationships. The book stimulates and, though we cannot agree with a number of its liberal religious propositions, it should attain its end, the awakening of interest in, and true understanding and appreciation of the Asiatic and his culture.

PAUL F. D'ARCY.

My Brother Americans. Carlos P. Romulo. Doubleday. $2.50.

THIS IS Carlos Romulo speaking—the editor and publisher of Manila *Herald;* not the brigadier general. "Rommy" (to those who know him on those terms) has both these characters. His mission, on which

600 years of conflicting rights

Russo-Polish Relations

By S. KONOVALOV

Professor of Oxford and Birmingham Universities

A BRIEF, authoritative summary of the problems of Russia and Poland since 1340, incorporating the work of Sir John Maynard, one of Britain's most distinguished students of Russian history.

At a time when opinions in this controversy are strongly held and bitterly contested, this temperate, judicious book presents the facts clearly and understandably.

Complete with maps, 50 pages of historical documents, and the text of the Yalta declaration on Polish sovereignty.

At your bookstore, Princeton University Press

Just published, $1.50 *Princeton, N. J.*

THE CATHOLIC WORKER

(Member of Catholic Press Association)

A monthly paper dedicated to the cause of labor, the poor, the oppressed.

Written in the language of the man on the street, THE CATHOLIC WORKER is openly and unashamedly the champion of the have-nots.

Articles on strikes, civil liberties, war, national policy, labor unions, the land, the Works of Mercy.

House of Hospitality in New York and 40 affiliated groups and houses in various American cities.

Subscription, 25c per year. Foreign, 80c per year. Bundle orders, 10 or more copies, 1c per copy plus postage.

THE CATHOLIC WORKER, 115 Mott St., N. Y. C.

Please send me THE CATHOLIC WORKER for .... years. I am enclosing $..... My subscription starts with the ..... issue.

Name .....

Address .....

Post Office .....State.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he flew from Bataan to San Francisco, was essentially a military one. Manuel Quezon certainly knew that Americans were not awake to what was happening in the Pacific, either before or after the disgrace of Pearl Harbor. Douglas MacArthur, "our General," the Filipino's General, is the only man in our Army High Command who knows Asiatics intimately as persons—which is a sidelight on why so many Americans are puzzled by him; "He is not orthodox," "Is he a showoff?" etc., etc. There have been long discussions about him among correspondents at the front as to whether he is, or is not "a phony." All of which has to do with the simple fact that most of those who broadcast and write innumerable best-selling books don't know Asiatics as persons and Douglas MacArthur does. Romulo, a Filipino, knows. He is belligerently "for" his General—seventy-five thousand Filipinos served with MacArthur and under him at Bataan, although none but the ten thousand Americans were ever mentioned until Romulo got going. From his first outraged resentment of our "complacency" he became, in the following months, "tops in the field," being more frequently and widely called on for lectures from all kinds of people than even Eleanor Roosevelt. As a colonel, later a brigadier general, it was his journalistic skill and his publisher's sense of effective publicity that carried beyond his combat experience to change many of our ideas of the nature of what we had got ourselves into in the Pacific.

A very few ultra-cynical newsmen set Romulo down as merely a MacArthur propagandist. Most people in the over four hundred cities in which he has spoken have accepted him as a phenomenon strange to them, since he is so thoroughly an Asiatic and at the same time so thoroughly American, and have accepted him, too, as an appealing personality, evidencing the possibility of what the title of his book conveys: our American *brothers*. Filipinos come largely of Malay stock, though with strong mixtures. Malays and warriors. Mohammedan Filipinos have never left any doubt in our American minds that they are fighting men by birth, breeding and predilection. Filipinos are also largely Catholic Christians. Romulo is quite positive about where he belongs in that regard. He is quite certain of his friendship with "American" missioners—Maryknoll above all.

Before his long experience of lecturing and of hammering as almost an obsession on this singleness and duality—which has produced three very readable books already—he had no knowledge of the run-of-mine American. That kind is a revelation to him, as it should be to our own "experts," "bureaucrats" and diplomatic guides of our destinies. They are the Americans who made and make America in continuous process—the people whom Henry Wallace, Wendell Willkie, and various brain-trusters call (so annoyingly!) "the common man." Romulo has discovered this "common man." He loves him—this man who is naturally absorbed in his own American life and is content with it; *not* "complacent" in the false sense in which our ivory towers use it. He is profoundly ignorant of the outside world—because he has never needed to know until now how our governmental machinery works. Yes, he is sentimental and quick to prejudice, but underneath he has an extraordinarily sound fund of common sense. It is that discovery which makes Romulo's book very valuable in all its implications for the future of the Pacific and of Asia.

WILLIAM FRANKLIN SANDS.

The House in Clewe Street. Mary Lavin. Atlantic-Little. $3.00.

ON THE upper reaches of the Boyne, thirty miles or so northwest of Dublin, is the ancient town of Trim, once the capital of Ireland; or at least the seat of Norman-Irish parliaments. Today it's the county seat of Meath and the market town for the surrounding Plain of Tara. So it has the court-house and the market place; it supports a few solicitors, a few doctors, a few auctioneers. And it has, I dare say, its proper share of penny-pinching Catholic landlords who—not being aristocrats by blood—shrewdly avoid sending their children to good schools. (Unless you're born to it, my love, mental effort can only play the devil with your sanity.)

Irish historians love Trim, there are so many things about it that only Irish historians can explain; the old landlords, for example, who are Protestants and gentlemen and therefore sit a horse with grace, and the new landlords who are Catholics and therefore do not, cannot, smell of saddle leather. Also, of course, Trim has its ruins; in particular, the ruins of an old Norman wall and of a great Norman fortress called King John's Castle. De Lacey built it, but King John slept there one night, and so it's King John's Castle; and it stands in a park that's overgrown with weeds, and the story goes that it's haunted, but the story isn't taken seriously any more and so it fails of its purpose, which was to keep morally frail young couples out of the park after sunset. King John's Castle is the dominating feature of Trim. It's a sad, dripping place.

And now Mrs. Lavin has drawn for us a portrait of Trim. She calls it Castlerampart, but it's Trim all right; and it's Trim without false coloring matter. It's Trim under a pale sun when the weather is fine, and under wet, windy skies all the rest of the time. It's Trim seen in a cold gray light—which is, after all, the authentic light of Ireland. And don't let anybody tell you that Mrs. Lavin, who was born in Masachusetts, looks upon the Irish scene with alien eyes. With this distinguished novel she takes her place among the best writers Ireland has produced in a hundred years.

She has drawn for us a sensitive, honest picture of Trim, and of the family who lived there in the landlord's home in Clewe street: the father, who made each penny count though he had outlived the necessity for doing so; the son-in-law, a solicitor, who breaks his neck the minute he sets up as a gentleman and tries riding to hounds; the married daughter, who dies young; the orphaned grandson, who is raised (so perilously close to the castle park) by his two maiden aunts; and Onny, who works in the kitchen by day and goes home o' nights by way of the castle park. You may not like Onny, but you won't easily forget her.

As a novel, "Clewe Street" is probably too long; it runs to 530 pages. But tragedies told briefly are six for five cents in your daily newspaper. Again, time passes slowly in Trim, and how else than by a piling up of detail is a novelist to convey the sense of slowly passing days? How else, indeed, can one give power—as Mrs. Lavin certainly succeeds in doing—to what must otherwise have been a rather trivial story? There are moments in this book when the story has the intensity and some of the nobility of the highest drama. There is the solicitor's lovely proposal to Lily Coniffe in the garden. There is the physical attractiveness of that fine girl Agnes Finnerty, and there is the lie, so needless, that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

betrays her as the trivial-minded thing she really is. There is the thunderstorm that reveals the sheer animal fear in Onny; there is the quarrel that discloses the appalling shallowness of her understanding; and there is the interview she has with the two maiden aunts that shows you in the end who, for all their shortcomings, are entitled to respect, and who is the pretty little slut.

Just the same, I wish a hundred pages of this book had been weeded out. For example, the race of the two funeral corteges to the cemetery contributes nothing to it; and if the same story has not been told twice before, by Carleton and again by William Sharp, I'll confess my memory has played me tricks.

On the other hand, I must pay tribute to Mrs. Lavin's quite exceptional talent; here is some of the finest writing that has come out of Ireland in many a year, and though there is great and laudable honesty, there is no vulgarity in this book. Other reviewers, I am aware, have thought the characters wooden, but that, I think, is a very wrong idea. I have not in years come across a portrait so appealingly true as that of Aunt Theresa. It is the case, however, that the lyrical note is strong in Mrs. Lavin's prose; and her characters, though sharply and firmly conceived, are infused with a kind of poetic intensity that carries them, I suppose, to the point of verging on abstractions; so that you can, perhaps, forget at one moment how real these people were the moment before. But you won't have any trouble of this sort, be sure of it, if you happen to have any Irish relations of your own.

DAVID MARSHALL.

Family Tree. Florence Maple. Knopf. $2.50.

PIPPA passes through Kakanka briefly and three men are forever different. Stephen cuts the apron strings which bind him to a wicked mother; Nick stops drinking, fornicating, fighting, and sulking to join the army and make a man of himself; and Blythe, who is married to a nymphomaniac, gets the courage to slap her and send her packing, and to persuade Judelle (Pippa) to be his wife. Also, he quite miraculously stops drinking, and devotes himself to his neglected son. Judelle is a poised middle-aged woman who has had wide experience with men. She knows each man's line, and how to play up to it, at the same time taking care of herself. The author says she is seventeen, but this is a mistake. In view of the fact, however, that the author insists that she is seventeen, it becomes difficult to accept her engagement to Blythe as the happy ending the author obviously intends it to be. Many casual lusts are recounted so casually that there is not a temptation in the carload. The story has suspense, several undeveloped sub-plots as unnecessary as tassels attached to a skirt hem, and the whole is written in the manner of the traditional desk-chair romance. It will leave thoughtful readers (but thoughtful persons will not read it) greatly depressed. Where the author has seen romance they will see a dry rot eating at the vitals of our society.

SISTER MARIELLA, O.S.B.

Big Democracy. Paul H. Appleby. Knopf. $2.75.

MR. APPLEBY, one of the most distinguished and most universally respected public servants brought to Washington by the New Deal, who is now back in private life operating a radio station in the Far West, in the fall of 1942 gave a series of lectures at Iowa State College dealing with what might be called the personnel aspect of our democratic government. In a word, his

The Names of Your Dear Ones

. . . may be put under the altar at the headquarters of the Catholic Medical Mission Board by sending a donation in aid of the work, with the request that the name be placed under the altar. Living or departed, the one whose name is thus placed under our altar will receive a special share in many prayers and good works faithfully offered for all who aid us, and especially for all whose names are under our altar.

Every month two novenas of Masses are said for all whose names are under the altar, and many missionaries and the people pray for all our friends. Send the names and the offering to the Catholic Medical Mission Board, 10 West 17th St., New York 11, N. Y.

MADONNA HOUSE BENEFIT SHOP

Proceeds for the poor of the Lower East Side.

Queensboro Bridge Market

59th St. & First Ave. **Eldorado 5-4794**

WE NEED:

Clothing Furniture House Furnishings

We will call for anything you will give. Contributions of money will greatly help our work here among God's poor.

MADONNA HOUSE

169-175 Cherry Street New York City 2

FOR YOUR COUNTRY
FOR YOUR FUTURE
BUY WAR BONDS

THE NEED IS GREATER for blood donations after VE day! A sharp decrease in volunteers has created a threat to the essential steady supply for our Pacific fighting fronts. Phone your local Red Cross chapter today! Give a pint of blood to save a life!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PORTSMOUTH PRIORY SCHOOL

Portsmouth, Rhode Island

23 miles from Providence, 8 miles from Newport.

CONDUCTED by American Monks of the English Benedictine Congregation, assisted by Lay Masters.

CURRICULUM based on 14 Centuries of Benedictine educational tradition, prepares for all colleges and technical schools.

SIX FORMS, comprising 7th and 8th grades and four years of high school. Standard Preparatory Course. Added opportunities in Mathematics and Physics. College Board Examination.

EVERY facility for Athletics. Sailing on inland waters of Narragansett Bay. 225 acres, including Farm operated by School. Scholarships available.

For further information apply to Secretary.

MARYWOOD COLLEGE

Scranton, Pennsylvania

A Catholic College for Women

Conducted by the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary

A.B., B.S., Mus.B. degrees ***Fully accredited***

Students prepared for careers in Medicine, Law, Music, Teaching, Dramatics, Vocational Home Economics, Dietetics, Secretarial Science, Art, Librarianship, Nursing, Social Service, Clinical Psychology. Special courses in Liturgical Music for Organists and Choirmasters, Supervisor's course in Music and Art. Registered for teacher's license by New York Board of Regents.

Address Registrar

SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE
NOTRE DAME
HOLY CROSS, INDIANA
SCHOOL OF SACRED THEOLOGY
for Sisters and Lay-women
Prerequisites: A degree of Bachelor of Arts
A reading knowledge of Latin

Mount Saint Agnes Junior College

Mount Washington, Baltimore 9, Maryland

Resident and Day Students

Conducted by the Sisters of Mercy

Liberal Arts, Music, Pre-technician, Homemaking, Pre-nursing. General and Medical Secretarial Curricula leading to Associate in Arts Diploma

ST. GENEVIEVE OF THE PINES

ASHEVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA

Distinctive—Accredited

JUNIOR COLLEGE—HIGH SCHOOL—GRAMMAR SCHOOL

Secretarial, Liberal Arts, Home Economics Courses, College Preparatory and Terminal Curricula, Boarding and Day.

Address: Sister Registrar

SCHOOL OF THE HOLY CHILD

SUFFERN, NEW YORK

Accredited. College preparatory and general course. Art, Music, Dancing, Dramatics. Outdoor sports. Resident and Day School. Separate Junior Department. In beautiful Ramapo Valley. 40 minutes from New York City. *Catalogue. Address The Prefect.* Phone: Suffern 765.

subject was the bureaucracy about which we constantly hear so many diatribes and so little praise. On the basis of these lectures he has produced a short book which is of the sort that one cannot help wishing would be read by every citizen. For it is filled with common sense and wisdom and reasonableness.

The thesis of "Big Democracy"—if it may be said to have a thesis—is that in a society like ours a vast governmental bureaucracy is inevitable and necessary. Mr. Appleby neatly remarks that opponents of bureaucracy never are against increasing any portion of the bureaucracy which furthers their interests. What they oppose is bureaucracy in general, and that is to tilt at windmills. Since we are forced to have a large bureaucracy, just as any business quickly develops precisely the same phenomenon, our problem is to try to provide the best bureaucracy possible, and where we have failed the worst in this regard is in filling the posts on the higher levels. Our educators have an obligation to take this into account in the future.

Obviously it is no terrible problem to find government clerks; it may be devastatingly difficult to find bureau or division chiefs. For very rarely does a business executive make a good top level bureaucrat. He is too much in the habit of making decisions with only a single interest involved, whereas an officer of the government may have to take into account a dozen or more interests, each of which may be differently affected by his decision. We need, in other words, to build up a tradition of public service among our people, so that our school training will not be so universally aimed at self-improvement or self-advancement alone.

What Mr. Appleby has to say on red tape, on decentralization, on politics, on patronage, on relations between Congress and the executive departments, is extremely cogent and calm and, I repeat, wise. No one who reads this book is ever again likely to be so readily annoyed in his dealings with government or so easily persuaded when in his favorite newspaper he reads of some of the more acutely peculiar goings on in government.

HARRY LORIN BINSSE.

CONTRIBUTORS

Afranio COUTINHO is a Brazilian writer and critic who has published a book on Machado de Assis and has translated two of the works of Jacques Maritain into Portuguese.

Ina SUGIHARA was born in Las Animas, Colo. She lived in California from 1933 to 1942, moving to New York City in March of the latter year. She holds a degree from the University of California, Berkeley, and has studied with the graduate faculty of the New School for Social Research in New York. She is now connected with the Religious News Service.

George STREATOR is at present employed by the War Production Board.

James RORTY is an American publicist who has in recent years been principally concerned with cooperatives and nutritional problems. His most widely known book dealt with advertising and was entitled "His Master's Voice." He lives in northern New Jersey.

William AGAR was formerly director of Freedom House.

Leo CAMP is a graduate student at Laval University, Quebec, Canada.

Paul F. D'ARCY is a Maryknoll seminarian who has recently been admitted to the deaconate.

William Franklin SANDS has recently published an important volume of reminiscences, "Our Jungle Diplomacy." He lives in Washington, D. C.

David MARSHALL has spent many years on a life of Parnell. He is the author of "Model Railroad Engineering."

Sister MARIELLA, O.S.B., teaches at the College of Saint Benedict, St. Joseph, Minn. She is a distinguished anthologist and critic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED